



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,058	01/09/2006	Romolo Montanari	273232US0XPCT	4271
22850 7590 09/01/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
BOYER, RANDY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/01/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/539,058

Applicant(s)

MONTANARI ET AL.

Examiner

RANDY BOYER

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 and 39-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 16, 17, 19-36 and 39-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12-15 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11 June 2010
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notes of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office Action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7 June 2010 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Examiner acknowledges Applicant's response filed 7 June 2010 containing amendments to the claims and remarks.
3. Claims 1-36 and 39-42 are pending. Claims 41 and 42 are newly added.
4. The previous rejection of claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 21-24, and 28-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Nolley (US 4,124,486) are withdrawn in view of Applicant's remarks and Examiner's reconsideration of the record.
5. A new grounds for rejection of claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 21-24, and 28-32 is entered under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Nolley.
6. The remaining previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are maintained. Likewise, newly added claims 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The rejections follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 21-24, 28-32, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nolley (US 4,124,486).

11. With respect to claim 1, Nolley discloses a process comprising: (a) mixing at least part of a heavy feedstock (1) and/or at least most of the stream containing asphaltenes (31) obtained in a deasphalting unit (17) with a suitable hydrogenation catalyst (see Nolley, column 6, lines 13-34) and sending the mixture obtained to a hydrotreatment reactor (7) into which hydrogen (3, 6) is charged (see Nolley, column 6, lines 34-36); (b) sending the hydrotreatment reaction product (8) to one or more flash steps (12, 27) whereby the different fractions coming from the hydrotreatment reaction are separated; and (c) recycling at least part of the liquid (14, 20) leaving the flash unit (12, 27) to the deasphalting zone (17) in the presence of solvents and obtaining two streams therefrom, one consisting of deasphalted oil (18) and the other (29) containing asphaltenes; wherein the stream containing asphaltenes (29) coming from the deasphalting unit (17) is sent to a treatment section (30) with a suitable solvent for the separation of the product into a solid fraction (31) and a liquid fraction (2, 19) from which the solvent can be subsequently removed.

Nolley does not explicitly disclose wherein only "a fraction" of the stream comprising asphaltenes (29) coming from the deasphalting unit (17) is sent to the treatment section (30).

However, Nolley discloses wherein the *entire* stream containing asphaltenes (29) coming from the deasphalting unit (17) is sent to the treatment section (30).

Therefore, Nolley provides explicit suggestion for sending at least "a fraction" of the *entire* stream containing asphaltenes (29) coming from the deasphalting unit (17) to the treatment section (30). In this regard, it is not seen where any new or unexpected

results would be obtained by sending only "a fraction" of the stream containing asphaltenes coming from the deasphalting unit to the treatment section.

Thus, Examiner finds Applicant's claim 1 unpatentable over the disclosure of Nolley.

12. With respect to claim 4, Nolley discloses wherein at least part (2) of the liquid fraction is recycled to the hydrotreatment reactor (7).

13. With respect to claims 10 and 11, Nolley discloses wherein all the heavy feedstock (1) is mixed with a suitable hydrogenation catalyst (see Nolley, column 6, lines 34-36) and sent to the hydrotreatment reactor (7), whereas at least 80% (2) of the stream containing asphaltenes (31) is recycled to the hydrotreatment zone (7) (see Nolley, column 10, lines 14-18).

14. With respect to claims 16 and 17, Nolley discloses wherein the entire flash separation residue (14) is recycled to the deasphalting zone (17).

15. With respect to claims 21 and 22, Nolley discloses wherein the hydrotreatment step is carried out at a temperature ranging from 550°F to 1000°F (about 288°C to 538°C) and a pressure ranging from 500 psi to 4000 psi (about 3.4 MPa to 27.6 MPa) (see Nolley, column 6, lines 34-52).

16. With respect to claim 23, Nolley discloses wherein the deasphalting step is carried out at a temperature ranging from 50°F to 600°F (about 10°C to 315°C) and a pressure ranging from 100 psi to 1000 psi (about 0.7 MPa to 6.9 MPa) (see Nolley, column 6, lines 1-6).

17. With respect to claim 24, Nolley discloses wherein the deasphalting solvent is a light paraffin having 3 to 5 carbon atoms (see Nolley, column 5, lines 44-51).

18. With respect to claims 28-31, Nolley discloses wherein molybdenum catalyst may be used in an amount ranging from 1% to 25% by weight (see Nolley, column 6, lines 13-33 and 40-44).

19. With respect to claim 32, Nolley discloses wherein the stream (8) containing hydrotreatment reaction product is subjected to a high pressure separation pre-step (9) to obtain a light fraction (21) and a heavy fraction (11), the heavy fraction (11) alone being sent to the flash separation step (12).

20. With respect to claim 42, Nolley discloses wherein the solvent comprises a portion of the deasphalted stream (29) comprising asphaltenes (see Nolley, column 10, lines 10-18).

21. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 16, 17, 19-36, and 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (US 5,124,026) in view of Nolley (US 4,124,486), Coleman (US 3,816,295), and Yan (US 4,334,976).

22. With respect to claims 1 and 2, Taylor discloses a process comprising: (a) contacting at least part of a heavy feedstock (58) with a suitable hydrogenation catalyst (see Taylor, column 7, lines 57-66) and sending the mixture obtained to a hydrotreatment reactor (60) into which hydrogen is charged (see Taylor, column 7, lines 57-66); (b) separating the hydrotreatment reaction product into different fractions (62, 64, 66, 68, 70, 78); and (c) recycling at least part of the liquid fraction (80) to the deasphalting zone (88) in the presence of solvents and obtaining two streams therefrom, one consisting of deasphalted oil (92, 116) and the other (94, 118) containing asphaltenes; wherein the stream containing asphaltenes (94) coming from the deasphalting unit (88) is sent to a treatment section with a suitable solvent for the

separation of the product into a solid fraction and a liquid fraction from which the solvent can be subsequently removed (see Taylor, column 11, lines 12-16).

Taylor does not disclose: (1) wherein the hydroconversion catalysts are mixed with the heavy feedstock and used in a slurry phase operation; or (2) wherein only “a fraction” of the stream comprising asphaltenes (94) coming from the deasphalting unit (88) is sent to the treatment section.

However, Taylor discloses wherein the hydrotreatment reactor is operated as an ebullated bed which is an art-recognized substitute hydrotreatment means for slurry phase operations (see e.g., Nolley (US 4,124,486), column 6, lines 13-16; and Coleman (US 3,816,295), column 3, lines 29-30). See MPEP §§ 2144.06 and 2144.07. In addition, Taylor discloses wherein the *entire* stream containing asphaltenes (94) coming from the deasphalting unit (88) is sent to the treatment section (see Taylor, column 11, lines 12-20).

Therefore, Taylor provides explicit suggestion for sending at least “a fraction” of the *entire* stream containing asphaltenes (94) coming from the deasphalting unit (88) to the treatment section. In this regard, it is not seen where any new or unexpected results would be obtained by sending only “a fraction” of the stream containing asphaltenes coming from the deasphalting unit to the treatment section.

Thus, Examiner finds Applicant's claim 1 unpatentable over the disclosure of Taylor in view of Nolley, Coleman, and Yan.

23. With respect to claim 3, Taylor discloses wherein at least part of the asphaltene stream may be separated from the solvent and used as fuel (see Taylor, column 11, lines 12-16).

24. With respect to claims 5, 6, 24, and 41, Taylor discloses the use of butane and/or pentane as solvent (see Taylor, column 10, lines 33-34) which are art-recognized substitutes for xylene solvent (see e.g., Yan (US 4,334,976), column 3, lines 67-68; and column 4, lines 1-10).

25. With respect to claims 7-9, Taylor discloses the use of variable solvent ratios (see Taylor, column 10, lines 33-39 and 62-66).

26. With respect to claims 16 and 17, Taylor discloses wherein a "substantial portion" (80) of the separation residue stream (72) is recycled to the deasphalting unit (88) (see Taylor, column 8, lines 52-56).

27. With respect to claims 19 and 20, Taylor discloses wherein the separation is effected at a suitable pressure so as to obtain light gases, naphtha, distillate, gas oil, and resid as individual fractions (see Taylor, Fig. 1 and accompanying text).

28. With respect to claims 21 and 22, Taylor discloses wherein typical hydrotreating conditions include a temperature in the range of 650°F to 750°F (about 343°C to 399°C) and a pressure in the range of 1000 psi to 1800 psi (about 6.9 MPa to 12.4 MPa) (see Taylor, column 9, lines 25-30).

29. With respect to claims 23 and 25, Taylor discloses wherein the deasphalting step is carried out under supercritical conditions with one or more steps and a temperature in the range of 150°F to 512°F (about 65°C to 266°C) (depending on the solvent used) (see Taylor, column 11, lines 21-28; and column 10, lines 15-24) and a pressure in the range of 395 psi to 530 psi (about 2.7 MPa to 3.6 MPa) (see Taylor, column 10, lines 15-24).

30. With respect to claims 26 and 27, Taylor discloses wherein the stream consisting of deasphalted oil (92) is separated into various fractions (see Taylor, Fig. 1 and accompanying text).

31. With respect to claims 28-31, Taylor discloses the use of a hydrotreating catalyst typically comprising a hydrogenating component dispersed on a porous refractory inorganic oxide support (see Taylor, column 8, lines 13-15). Taylor is not otherwise limited with respect to the specific catalyst used. In this regard, Examiner notes that the use of molybdenum catalysts is common in the art for the conversion of heavy asphaltenic feedstocks (see e.g., Nolley (US 4,124,486), column 6, lines 13-33; and column 6, lines 40-44).

32. With respect to claims 32-34, Taylor discloses wherein the hydrotreatment reaction products may be separated into a light fraction and a heavy fraction, with the heavy fraction being sent for further processing and subsequent separation; and wherein the light fraction may be sent to a post-treatment hydrogenation section (74), producing a lighter gas fraction and a heavier fraction containing hydrotreated naphtha and gas oil (see Taylor, Fig. 1 and accompanying text); and wherein the post-treatment hydrogenation reaction is effected at a pressure in the range of about 1000 psi to about 1800 psi (about 6.9 MPa to 12.4 MPa) (see Taylor, column 9, lines 20-32).

33. With respect to claims 35 and 36, Coleman discloses wherein slurry catalyst systems are art-recognized substitutes for the ebullated bed system used in Taylor (see Coleman (US 3,816,295), column 3, lines 29-30); and Nolley discloses the recovery and recycle of hydrotreating catalyst in a slurry catalyst system (see Nolley (US 4,124,486), column 6, lines 29-33).

34. With respect to claim 39, Taylor suggests taking the asphaltene fraction from the deasphalting section and contacting with a solvent so as to effect a separation of a solid fraction and a liquid fraction (see Taylor, column 11, lines 12-16).

35. With respect to claim 40, the separation and recycling of a process component for reuse is well known in the art. Moreover, the skilled person would have been motivated to provide for such process modification in order to provide a more efficient process.

36. With respect to claim 42, Taylor discloses wherein the solvent comprises a portion of the deasphalted stream comprising asphaltenes (see Taylor, column 11, lines 12-20).

Allowable Subject Matter

37. Claims 12-15 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

38. Claims 12-15 and 18 are indicated allowable for the reasons provided in the Office Action mailed 3 February 2009.

Response to Arguments

39. Applicant's arguments filed 7 June 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

40. Examiner understands Applicant's arguments to be:

- I. Nolley discloses a simple separation by flash to separate solvent added in the preceding deasphalting step. This is distinct from the “deoiling” of amended claim 1, and Nolley does not disclose or suggest such a “deoiling.”
- II. Nolley discloses adding the solvent to the concentrated deasphalted stream exiting the deasphalting section, and not to “a fraction” of the deasphalted stream comprising asphaltenes.
- III. Taylor fails to disclose “deoiling” of a fraction of the stream containing asphaltenes by addition of a solvent.
- IV. In Taylor, the solvent is added in the deasphalting section, and not to a stream containing asphaltenes from which it is subsequently removed. Accordingly, Taylor does not disclose the addition of solvent to an asphaltene “fraction.”
- V. Neither Nolley nor Taylor discloses use of an aromatic solvent.

41. With respect to Applicant’s first and second arguments, Examiner notes that the claimed “deoiling” involves the addition (mixing) of a solvent (16) with a stream containing asphaltenes (4) from the deasphalting unit (SDA) (see Applicant’s specification, page 24, lines 5-6; page 25, lines 6-7; and Fig. 1). In this regard, Nolley discloses wherein the stream containing asphaltenes (29) from the deasphalting unit (17) already comprises a portion of solvent therein (see Nolley, column 10, lines 25-27). Thus, Nolley discloses a mixed stream of solvent and asphaltenes, the same as is present in the claimed “deoiling” step – it is not seen where any new or unexpected results would be obtained by adding *new* or *additional* solvent to such asphaltene containing stream (as in the claimed “deoiling”) versus providing an asphaltene containing stream already in admixture with a solvent (as disclosed in Nolley). The

selection of any order of performing process steps is *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results. See MPEP § 2144.04(IV)(C) (citing *In re Burhans*, 154 F.2d 690 (CCPA 1946)).

42. With respect to Applicant's second argument, Nolley's disclosure of the *entire* stream containing asphaltenes (29) coming from the deasphalting unit (17) being sent to the treatment section (30) provides explicit suggestion for sending *at least* "a fraction" of the *entire* stream containing asphaltenes (29) coming from the deasphalting unit (17) to the treatment section (30) (see discussion *supra* at paragraph 11).

43. With respect to Applicant's third and fourth arguments, Examiner notes that the claimed "deoiling" involves the addition (mixing) of a solvent (16) with a stream containing asphaltenes (4) from the deasphalting unit (SDA) (see Applicant's specification, page 24, lines 5-6; page 25, lines 6-7; and Fig. 1). In this regard, Taylor discloses wherein the stream containing asphaltenes (94) from the deasphalting unit (88) already comprises a portion of solvent therein (see Taylor, column 11, lines 12-16). Thus, Taylor discloses a mixed stream of solvent and asphaltenes, the same as is present in the claimed "deoiling" step – it is not seen where any new or unexpected results would be obtained by adding *new* or *additional* solvent to such asphaltene containing stream (as in the claimed "deoiling") versus providing an asphaltene containing stream already in admixture with a solvent (as disclosed in Taylor). The selection of any order of performing process steps is *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results. See MPEP § 2144.04(IV)(C) (citing *In re Burhans*, 154 F.2d 690 (CCPA 1946)).

44. With respect to Applicant's fourth argument, Taylor's disclosure of the entire stream containing asphaltenes (94) coming from the deasphalting unit (88) being sent to the treatment section provides explicit suggestion for sending at least "a fraction" of the entire stream containing asphaltenes (94) coming from the deasphalting unit (88) to the treatment section (see discussion *supra* at paragraph 22).

45. With respect to Applicant's fifth argument, Taylor discloses the use of butane and/or pentane as solvent (see Taylor, column 10, lines 33-34) which are art-recognized substitutes for xylene (an aromatic) solvent (see e.g., Yan (US 4,334,976), column 3, lines 67-68; and column 4, lines 1-10).

Conclusion

46. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy Boyer whose telephone number is (571) 272-7113. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 10:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn A. Caldarola, can be reached at (571) 272-1444. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 1797

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Randy Boyer/

Examiner, Art Unit 1797